

Amendment to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 2 as requested by the Examiner. This sheet replaces the original sheet containing Figs. 1-3. In the amended Fig. 2, reference number 38 and its associated lead line have been removed because they are unnecessary and are not identified in the written description.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet with Figs. 1-3.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner indicated in a Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment, dated August 31, 2005, that Applicant's Amendment submitted August, 17, 2005, was not fully responsive. Applicant subsequently submitted a Supplemental Amendment on September 27, 2005 ("Supplemental Amendment I") in the place of the previous Amendment. The Examiner further indicated in a second Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment, dated October 17, 2005, that Applicant's Supplemental Amendment I was deficient. Applicant respectfully submits this second Supplemental Amendment in the place of the previous Amendments.

By Office action dated May 18, 2005, the Examiner has allowed claims 1, 2, 5 and 9 and has rejected claims 3, 4, 6-8 and 10-15. In response, Applicant has cancelled claims 3, 6-8 and 10-15 and has amended claims 4 and 9. New claims 16 and 17 have also been added.

Objections to the Specification and Drawings

In the initial Office action, dated May 18, 2005, the Examiner indicated "[o]n Fig. 2, there is no description in the specification of number '30.'" (*Emphasis added*). Accordingly, the Examiner requested that the Applicant "[e]ither cancel such number from Fig. 2 or include its description in the specification." Upon review of the specification as filed, reference number "30" of Fig. 2 is used consistently throughout the written description to identify a spring. Therefore, Applicant concluded that the Examiner's concern was moot in view of the facts. Applicant did not, however, properly respond to the Examiner's concern by bring the facts to the Examiner's attention.

In a Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment, dated August 31, 2005, the Examiner objected that the Applicant's response to the initial Office action was deficient because it did not address the lack of description with respect to number "38." Applicant respectfully points out that reference number "30" not "38" was identified in the initial Office action. Nevertheless, Applicant agrees with the Examiner that reference number 38 is used in Fig. 2 with no identification or explanation in the written description. Because reference number 38 is

unnecessary for complete description of the claimed invention, Applicant attempted to delete the number 38 and associated lead line from Fig. 2 as suggested by the Examiner.

In a second Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment, dated October 17, 2005, the Examiner considered Applicant's Supplemental Amendment filed on September 29, 2005 to be non-compliant because the Replacement Sheet of drawings showing amended Fig. 2 did not include all figures appearing on the previous version. Applicant agrees with the objection and apologizes for the error. Applicant's representative, who submitted the preceding Supplemental Amendment, was unaware that all three figures had been combined under one sheet in the application as filed. Applicant respectfully submits a corrected Replacement Sheet including Figs. 1-3. Therefore, Applicant submits that the Examiner's concern has been adequately addressed.

§112 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 4, 6-8, 11, 12, 14 and 15 as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicant has cancelled claims 3, 6-8, 11, 12, 14 and 15, thus rendering the rejections moot except with respect to claim 4.

The Examiner contends that claim 4 is indefinite because it recites "a first pair of opposing legs and a second pair of opposing legs" without any correlation to the "at least three legs" previously recited in claim 1, from which claim 4 depends. The Examiner further asserts that claim 4 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the indefiniteness rejection.

Applicant has amended claim 4 to clarify that the claimed "at least three legs" *comprise* "a first pair of opposing legs and a second pair of opposing legs." Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment overcomes the rejection by correlating the first and second pair of opposing legs with the claimed "at least three legs." Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner remove the rejection to claim 4.

§102 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 10-15 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102. Applicant has cancelled these claims, which relate only to the spring outside the context of the fuel vapor storage canister. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejections are now rendered moot.

Claim 9

The Examiner has allowed claim 9, which is directed to a method of assembling a fuel vapor storage canister. Nevertheless, Applicant has amended claim 9 to remove several unnecessary limitations.

As amended, claim 9 recites the step of positioning a spring inside a canister in a position to exert pressure on a movable partition within the canister *but no longer requires that the spring be located outside of a vapor storage chamber within the canister*. Furthermore, claim 9, as amended, requires that the spring in general exert pressure on the partition without requiring specifically that the *legs of the spring* exert pressure on the partition.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 as amended is supported by the application as filed and is still patentable over the art. Accordingly, prompt and favorable reconsideration is requested.


New Claims

Applicant has added new claim 16, which corresponds to amended claim 4 but which does not require that the first and second pair of opposing legs possess different spring rates.

New independent claim 17 is similar to claim 1 but expresses more clearly that the volume compensator may comprise first and second band springs that are angularly offset from one another. Support for claim 17 is found in paragraph [0012] of the application as filed.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required by this paper, or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 20-0809. Prompt and favorable examination is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey C. Metzcar (Reg. No. 52,027)

Date: November 4, 2005
THOMPSON HINE LLP
2000 Courthouse Plaza NE
10 West Second Street
Dayton, Ohio 45402-1758
PH (937) 443-6841
FX (937) 443-6805